

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
DECEMBER 4, 2013**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Cone, Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

ABSENT: Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer

- Chairman's Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-249 | 1184 E. Hildebrand |
| 2. Case No. 2013-395 | 13655 O'Connor |
| 3. Case No. 2006-322 | 849 E. Commerce |
| 4. Case No. 2013-390 | 849 E. Commerce |
| 5. Case No. 2013-387 | 322 W. Kings Hwy |
| 6. Case No. 2013-392 | 1430 Napier |
| 7. Case No. 2013-393 | 6161 Gibbs Sprawl |
| 8. Case No. 2013-357 | 308 W. Summit Ave. |
| 9. Case No. 2013-384 | 228 Furr Dr. |

Items 5 and 8 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve the remaining cases on the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2013-387

Applicant: Don McDonald/Thomas Bradley

Address: 322 W. Kings Hwy.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a 6 foot masonry wall along the rear property line with a 12 foot chimney for an outdoor fireplace; and
2. Construct a single bay side addition to the existing rear garage. The single-story, flat roof garage addition would feature a matching garage door and materials and would be slightly offset in plan from the original footprint.

FINDINGS:

- a. An previous request at this location for a 10 foot wall and 16 foot chimney was heard by the HDRC on October 16, 2013. At that time, staff recommended a 6 foot wall with 12 foot chimney. The applicant withdrew that request in favor of the current request.

- b. The existing masonry wall runs along the rear property line abutting an alley. Properties across the alley have the same R5 base zoning as 322 W Kings Hwy. Properties abutting the alley feature walls and fences at a consistent height of 6 feet.
- c. According to the table of heights included in UDC Section 35-514(d), the maximum permitted fence height for a single-family use is 6 feet. The current request is consistent with this standard.
- d. There is no section of the UDC that regulates the height of outdoor fireplace chimneys, provided that the structure does not exceed the maximum allowable building height allowed by the zoning. However, the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i recommend that the height of new structures be harmonious with other nearby elements. Given that there is a consistent 6 foot fence height along the alley, a 12 foot chimney that is only twice the height of the attached wall would be consistent with the spirit of the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i.
- e. The proposed side addition to the existing garage is minimal and compatible with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A in terms of visual impact and context and provides clear transition between the addition and the original garage.

1&2. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings

Withdrawn by the applicant.

8. HDRC NO. 2013-357

Applicant: Ann McGlone

Address: 308 W. Summit Ave.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a two story addition to the west side of the existing rear detached accessory building. The proposed west addition will include a carport at ground level and an enclosed space above. Exterior stairs are proposed to be constructed on the west side of the addition.
2. Construct a two story addition to the east side of the existing rear detached accessory building. The proposed addition will be constructed on an existing concrete slab and will have a small, second floor balcony on the east side with French doors on both the first and second floors.
3. Construct a link between the existing accessory building and the main house. The applicant proposes to connect the two structures through a two story height addition to the rear of the main house, attaching to the proposed east addition of the garage building. Since the main house is elevated, the proposed connection between the house and the garage will include stairs leading down to the ground floor of the garage and up to the second floor of the garage. This connection will have a stucco wall that steps up as it extends toward the garage. The existing curved garden wall between the buildings will be left in place and the existing gate will be replaced with a door into the proposed addition. The connector piece will attach to the main house at an existing rear window opening.

FINDINGS:

- a. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 23, 2013. At that meeting, the committee noted that the proposed additions to the garage will not be highly visible from the street due to the orientation of the garage and the existing landscape. Staff noted concern about connecting the main house to the addition and some suggestions were made about ways to keep the main mass of the connection closer to the garage and opening the connection with more windows. The committee found that the massing of the proposed additions is appropriate and that the proposed connection could potentially be removed in the future.
- b. The Design Review Committee performed a site visit to this property with the applicant and one member of the Monte Vista Historical Association (MVHA) on November 12, 2013. The committee discussed various ways to minimize the visual impact of the proposed connection between the main house and the garage including how the stair should be oriented, whether it can be located inside the proposed addition, or whether it can remain below the existing cornice lines of both structures. The committee noted that the proposed connection should be as light as possible. There was also discussion about the proposed exterior stair on the west side of the proposed carport and orienting that stair to exit at the rear and land at the front. The MVHA member indicated concern over the size of the proposed additions, particularly in relation to the

existing home which is fairly modest in scale.

- c. OHP staff performed a site visit to this property with the applicant on November 21, 2013. At that meeting, staff noted that there are site constraints limiting where any new addition can go. The applicant noted that the property owners are very concerned with maintaining the historic integrity of their home and felt that adding on to the existing garage rather than the main house would have less of a visual and physical impact on the property. The applicant also indicated that there has been exploration into lowering the height of the proposed connection to below the existing overhang as well as exploration into other ways to orient the proposed stair.
 - d. The home at 308 W. Summit first appears on the 1911-1950 Sanborn map. According to this map, the footprints of the main house and the garage have not changed substantially. A side porch on the main house was enclosed at some point and a rear addition was constructed.
 - e. According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, this home and carriage house were constructed in 1920, built by Coleman & Jenkins. Both structures were identified as contributing resources to the district and the home is listed as being in the Craftsman style with Spanish Eclectic influences.
 - f. The adjacent lot to this property, at the corner of W. Summit and Belknap Place, contains a landscaped green space.
 - g. The home at 308 W. Summit is at a lower elevation than the corner green space, making it difficult to see from Belknap Place. The landscaping around 308 W. Summit is fairly lush as well.
 - h. Only a portion of the existing rear garage is visible from the street and, while the proposed west addition would be visible from the public right-of-way, the proposed east addition and the proposed connection with the main house would be almost entirely concealed from view due to their placement on the site and the exiting vegetation.
 - i. The proposed additions will more than double the existing footprint of the garage, which is not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.B.iv. However, in this instance, staff finds that constructing a two story addition onto the two story existing garage is more appropriate than constructing a two story addition onto the one story main house.
 - j. The existing detached garage does not comply with current rear yard setbacks and the proposed additions would require variances in order to be constructed as submitted as they also encroach on the rear and side yard setbacks.
 - k. The proposed additions will use materials consistent with the existing structures on the site. While the detailing on the additions is proposed to match the existing building, an offset will be incorporated to visually reference the extent of the original building, in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Sections 1.A.iv and 3.A.i.
 - l. Throughout the Monte Vista Historic District, the typical pattern of development has one primary structure and detached accessory structures or garages on each property. While the proposal to connect the existing garage to the main house will alter the spatial relationships of the historic buildings on this property, the physical impact to the main house will be very limited and the visual impact from the public right-of-way will be minimal.
 - m. Currently the main house and the garage are connected by a garden wall. This existing wall will remain as part of this proposal and will help screen the proposed connector piece.
 - n. The proposed link touches the main house lightly, requiring the removal of an existing pair of windows, but not the creation of a brand new opening.
- 1 & 2. Staff recommends conceptual approval as submitted based on findings g-k.
3. Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings l-n with the following stipulations:
- a. That a section drawing be provided for final approval to show exactly how the link will connect to the main house and to the garage.
 - b. That the existing pair of rear windows to be removed on the main house as part of this project be stored on site for potential future reuse.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with stipulation applicant continue to investigate internal stairway, details of the new additions, and connector building.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

10. HDRC NO. 2013-299

Applicant: Steve Turner and Kerry Koehler

Address: 430 Adams St.

Postponed per the applicant

11. HDRC NO. 2013-279

Applicant: William McDonald

Address: 631 E. Guenther

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a 1,332 sf addition to the house at 631 E Guenther. The new construction will be pier and beam to match the floor height of the original house. Largely arranged to the north (side) of the original house, the additional will set back from the front façade and feature a new street-facing porch and gabled dormer. The entire addition will be located behind an existing privacy fence. Proposed materials are hardi board siding with similar dimensions and profile as the original house, stucco skirting, and galvalume standing seam metal roof with crimped ridge seam. The original house will be reroofed as well to match. Proposed new windows are wood, double hung and fixed windows.

2. Remove a non-contributing dormer on the rear of the house and construct a new dormer, similar to the one found on the front of the house.

FINDINGS:

a. This request was originally heard by the HDRC on September 4, 2013. At the public hearing, concern was expressed by the commissioners and citizens to be heard over the use of historical details in the addition. The commission voted to refer the case to the Design Review Committee.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 10, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant presented red-line drawings which illustrated simplified detailing in the porch and dormers of the addition. The committee members present expressed support for the revisions.

c. The applicant has since revised the proposal in response to staff's recommendation that future revisions to the design include a further reduction to the building footprint or an increase in setback from the front façade. The current proposal features a reduced footprint and lower roof ridge height. The addition porch roof has been reduced in depth. However, the overall setback of the addition from the front façade has not been increased. Staff is concerned that the closet portion extends past the front of the addition porch and side gable of the original house.

d. The Hilmar Guenther House at 631 E Guenther was constructed circa 1900 in the Folk Victorian style. The house is positioned on a large double lot and has a large side yard. A shed roof addition and shed dormer have been built onto the rear of the house.

e. In general, residential additions should be sited to the side or rear whenever possible. As submitted, the proposed addition is largely arranged to the side of the original house. An approximate 24-foot setback from the front plane of the

original house helps to reduce the addition's dominance from the street and provides a clear transition between the old and new, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv. However, staff finds that the setback could still be further increased for conformance with the guidelines.

- f. The new roofline will tie into the original structure behind an existing side gable as to not obscure any significant architectural features. However, the porch roof of the addition is proposed to extend below the gable. Staff finds that the porch roof of the addition could be further reduced to improve views of the original structure, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i and 1.B.i.
- g. As submitted, the proposed addition is approximately 1,332 sf (excluding porches). Due to the large lot and size of the yard, the proposed addition does not overwhelm the site. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv, residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. The existing house is approximately 2,305 sf (excluding porches), which meets this guideline. However, due to the placement of the addition predominately to the side of the original structure, further attempts to reduce the addition footprint would be more consistent with this guideline. The applicant has made minor revision to the side and rear of the addition to reduce its footprint by approximately 126 sf.
- h. As submitted in the revised drawings, the proposed height of the addition is subordinate to the height of the original house, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v.
- i. The proposed materials, although synthetic, will mimic the appearance of wood siding. The applicant has indicated that a smooth finish hardi product with similar dimensions as the wood siding on the original house will be used. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i.
- j. The proposed metal roof meets the guidelines for metal roofs outlined in the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.ii.
- k. The proposed new construction features simplified architectural details which will not confuse the history of the structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.
- l. The Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii. also address window openings. The applicant has worked with staff to develop the street-facing fenestrations. The revised drawings are consistent with this Guideline.
- m. Staff finds that the proposed work to the rear dormer of the original house will be a more appropriate addition than the current conditions, and is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii.
- n. As submitted, a non-heritage tree will be removed for the addition. A large pecan tree and palm tree are protected in the design. Any tree removal will require a permit from the City Arborist.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that porch roof be further reduced in depth to improve views of the original structure based on finding f and that the overall setback of the addition from the front façade be increased based on findings c and e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted based on findings a through n.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2013-388

Applicant: Eric Vaith

Address: 323 W. Hollywood

Withdrawn per the applicant. Applicant will return to HDRC with alternate plans

13. HDRC NO. 2013-386

Applicant: Adan Ochoa

Address: 307 Carolina

Withdrawn per the applicant. Applicant will return to HDRC with alternate plans.

14. HDRC NO. 2013-391

Applicant: Carlos Hernandez Aguilar

Address: 1119 N. Palmetto

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install a 4' tall wrought iron fence in the front yard and a 6' tall wood privacy fence in the rear yard.
2. Install asphalt shingles on the front porch roof to match the house. Replace rotten wood in kind to match existing at soffits and fascias. Remove vinyl siding to uncover wood siding. Repair foundation and install 18" tall stucco skirting around the base of the structure.
3. Install missing ridge cap vent on the existing addition roof.
4. Replace 6 wood windows with false divided lite aluminum frame windows. The proposed windows will be covered with wood screens.

FINDINGS:

- a. A stop work order was issued on November 1, 2013, for repairing the foundation, installing new windows and exterior repairs without a Certificate of Appropriateness. At the time, the original windows were still on site and the owner was instructed not to dispose of them. Staff performed a site visit to the property on November 21, 2013, at that time the original windows were still on site and in good condition.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, front yard fences should only be installed where historically present and when appropriate within a historic district. Front yard fences are common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The installation of a front yard fence is appropriate for this location. The proposed materials and height are consistent with the guidelines and compatible with historic fences within the district.
- c. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, deteriorated features such as fascias or soffits should be replaced in kind. The proposed repairs are appropriate and consistent with the guidelines and will not cause adverse effect to the structure.
- d. Materials that have not achieved historic significance on their own that are covering wood siding should be removed according to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Uncovering the siding underneath the existing vinyl siding is appropriate and consistent with the guidelines.
- e. New metal roofs should follow the specifications set by the Checklist for Metal Roofs listed in the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations. According to the guidelines, new roofs should not incorporate a ridge cap vent and should use a ridge cap with no end caps instead. However, the existing r-panel metal roof installed by the previous owner was constructed to use a ridge vent. Although the ridge cap is missing, the roof opening at the ridge exists. The current conditions of the roof on the addition warrant the installation of a ridge cap vent. Installing a low vent that does not protrude more than 2" from the line of the roof is appropriate in this case.
- f. Windows are character defining features that should be preserved. Historic windows should be repaired rather than replaced. When deteriorated beyond repair, they should be replaced in kind to match existing. Windows that are properly maintained and weatherstripped can be energy efficient. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, infilling historic window openings to accommodate modern stock sizes and using false divided lites should be avoided. The proposed window replacements are located at

the front of the home and are highly visible from the right of way. In addition, all other windows around the house have been replaced with modern windows and the existing 6 windows are the only original windows remaining on the house with the exception of a single window on the north elevation. The original wood windows, which are still intact in the back yard, should be reinstalled and repaired.

1-3. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a-e.

4. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on finding f. Staff recommends that the windows are repaired if possible or replaced in kind.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve items 1 through 3 as submitted based on findings a through e. Denial of item 4 based on finding f. The existing windows should be repaired if possible or replaced in kind.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2013-389

Applicant: Francisco J. Velazquez, III

Address: 727 S. Alamo

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace two front exterior doors with 8-foot wood doors with divided lights featuring beveled glass. The wood framing of the entries will be reconfigured to accommodate the doors and will include reconfigured transoms; and
2. Install a fabric canvas awning over the front façade of the building. The awning will be a 4-foot deep, quarter barrel configuration with 6" scalloped valence. The awning will be stretched across an aluminum frame secured to the building.

FINDINGS:

- a. The commercial building at 727 South Alamo was constructed circa 1890 as the Charles P. Steffler Baking Company (later known as Steffler's Model Bakery). Although it cannot be confirmed by photographic evidence, this building likely originally featured wood double doors at each entry which was common at that time. The entries have been modified over time to accommodate single leaf doors with different dimensions. A survey photo from the 1980's indicates that both entries had been reconfigured at some point to include a side light.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., historic door openings should not be enlarged or diminished to fit stock size doors. However, given that this is a masonry building and the wood framing around the doors appears to have been altered over time, staff finds that reconfiguring the door framing within the masonry opening is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii, commercial facades should be restored to known previous conditions. Staff finds that the two windows on either side of the door openings likely feature original the transom dimensions. The transoms located over the reconfigured doorways should be resized for consistency with the window transoms based on this guideline.
- d. This building would have originally featured a projecting canopy constructed of either wood or metal. The original anchors remain intact. A number of nearby commercial facades feature projecting canopies. Only two buildings in the immediate vicinity feature fabric awnings, both of which represent non-original conditions.

e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii, new awnings should be installed based on accurate evidence of the original conditions. Staff finds that a fabric awning would not be consistent with the known original conditions and is not appropriate.

1. Staff recommends approval with the stipulations that the existing masonry openings are not altered in any way and that the new transoms match the original window transoms in height based on findings a through c.

2. Staff does not recommend approval based on finding e. Staff recommends that the applicant consider options for reconstructing the original canopy based on finding d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Judson to reset to December 18, 2013

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

16. HDRC NO. 2013-385

Applicant: Mike Hollaway

Address: 247 (formerly 241-1) E. Kings Hwy.

Withdrawn by the applicant.

17. HDRC NO. 2013-393

Applicant: Sarah Panzarella

Address: 2110 W. Summit

Postponed per the applicant.

18. HDRC NO. 2013-394

Applicant: Diana Webb

Address: 216 W. Mariposa

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

Remove the existing siding on the home at 216 W. Mariposa, which is an asphalt shingle similar to a roofing shingle and replace it with stone to be more consistent with other homes in this area.

FINDINGS:

a. The home at 216 W. Mariposa first appears on the Sanborn map dated 1924-1950. According to this map, the home had a shallow front porch and an attached accessory structure. It appears that the home's form has not been substantially altered, although at some point the existing exterior material was applied over what is likely original horizontal wood siding.

b. According to the Olmos Park Terrace neighborhood survey, the home at 216 W. Mariposa was constructed in the Minimal Traditional style and had asbestos siding. It was identified as having high integrity.

c. While a large proportion of the homes in the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District have stone exteriors, this block of W. Mariposa has a mix of siding materials. On this block of W. Mariposa, there are 11 houses with asbestos siding, 6 houses with wood or hardi board siding, 4 houses with stucco exterior, 8 houses with stone exterior, and one house with brick exterior. The home at 216 W. Mariposa is the only one with its exact type of exterior material.

d. The existing exterior siding is not original to the home. Underneath the exterior shingle material is horizontal wood siding. Some areas of the underlying material are currently exposed and appear to be in good condition.

e. Consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations Section 1.B, exposing original wood siding that has been covered is appropriate and if replacement is necessary, new siding should match the original in size, scale, and character.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings c-e. Staff recommends that the original horizontal siding be repaired or replaced with an in-kind material if necessary.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant denial based on findings c through e. The original horizontal siding should be repaired or replaced with an in kind material if necessary.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:20.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair

